

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/857,596

Applicant(s)

MIDDLETON, NIGEL JOHN

Examiner

Patricia L. Nordmeyer

Art Unit

1772

## All Participants:

(1) Patricia L. Nordmeyer.

(2) Carl E. Moore, Jr..

## Status of Application: Rejected

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 8 July 2003

Time: 3:45 p.m.

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*The 35 U.S.C. 112 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection of the term "dome-like".*

Claims discussed:

*39 and 41*

Prior art documents discussed:

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 39 and 41 were presented as new claims in the last response dated May 2, 2003. Both claims contain the word "dome-like", which brought upon rejections under new matter under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph and the term being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph. For the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph, there is no basis or support in the specification for the term "dome-like". The specification refers to the projections on the surface of the material as "dome projections". The term was also rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph as being indefinite since it is unclear from the claim language and specification what is meant by "dome-like". If applicant changes the term to "dome", the change would overcome the rejections..